

E 380  
.J52

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005030213







AN

**ADDRESS**

TO THE

**CATHOLIC VOTERS**

OF

**BALTIMORE.**

With Your Sentiments

---

Baltimore:

PRINTED BY LUCAS & DEAVER

No. 19 South Calvert street

1828

E 387

352

AN

## ADDRESS, &c.

---

FELLOW CITIZENS:

When, in times of high political excitement, appeals are made by one party, to principles and feelings ordained by our Creator to better purposes, and which the wisdom of man would not voluntarily invoke to subserve any secular end, we are forced, in self-defence, to measures of retaliation. Respect for those with whom we are allied in politics and religion, imposes the task of guarding them against delusion; and those who began the controversy may find our excuse, if they seek it—in their own example. For us—Mr. Adams might have entertained any theological opinions, unmolested. His religion is to himself and his God; and we thank Heaven that under our free constitution, man has nothing to do with it. Had his intolerance been obtruded upon our personal notice, it might, perhaps, have incurred the intellectual chastisement it merited. Were his libels, as an author, sufficiently illustrated by genius, to give them prominence among the thousands with which we have been assailed, they might have been subjected to the harsh refutation they deserve. Each, however, of these motives to attack, being wanting, he might even have been spared the retribution due to his official insults towards our faith and its professors, while we passed them by as the effusions of private spleen prompting a mind of no common obduracy of prejudice.

But when we witness the shallow trick of attempting to enlist in his behalf, through their religious affections, the very men whose holiest impressions he has falsified and insulted; when we see a venerable man urged forward from his dignified and virtu-

ous retirement, into contests for which his habits and health alike unfit him, in the hope that those who kneel with him before the same altar, and partake of the same most holy sacrifice, will follow him from the temple to the polls; longer silence on our part, were a disgraceful acquiescence under ungenerous imputations, and the unresisting surrender of our dearest earthly interests, to the most unworthy artifices.

With the respectable Catholic, announced by the Adams convention, as a candidate for the next legislature, we have nothing here to do. He possesses our esteem and our regard. We venerate him as one of the fathers of our religious household. We yield him full credit for the sincerity of his political opinions, and we only regret that the weight of evidence does not affect us alike on every subject. But when a desperate party rely on him to conciliate, by his personal influence, the suffrages of his brothers in the faith, we have a right, as Catholics, to shew to Catholics, who is the man whom they are courted to sustain, in the person of their respected fellow christian.

John Quincy Adams, then, is the man, who, on our national jubilee, when every invidious feeling might be supposed at rest, and every child of the constitution, whether native American or his adopted Catholic brother, invited to share, without reserve, in the general joy, came forward in the robes of state, and thus described the Religion, for their conscientious adherence to which, millions of Irishmen have been exiled from their native shores, and millions still groan in galling bondage at home; that Religion, whose amiable and accomplished votaries, and beneficent institutions were about and around him; that Religion, whose professors first proclaimed, and in this very State, (to which the spot on which he stood but recently belonged) the principles of religious liberty, and to which the sole surviving Patriarch of the Revolution, whose name, appended to the "declaration of independence," he was about to profane by pronouncing it, looks for the best reward of his patriotism and private virtues.—"THAT PORTENTOUS SYSTEM OF DESPOTISM AND SUPERSTITION, WHICH, IN THE NAME OF THE MEEK AND HUMBLE JESUS, HAD BEEN SPREAD OVER THE CHRISTIAN WORLD."\*

"IN THE THEORIES OF THE CROWN AND THE MITRE," he went on to say, "MAN HAD NO RIGHTS. NEITHER THE BODY NOR THE SOUL OF THE INDIVIDUAL WAS HIS OWN. FROM THE IM-

\*Page 5, of "an Address delivered at the request of a Committee of the citizens of Washington, on the occasion of reading the Declaration of Independence, on the fourth of July, 1821, by John Quincy Adams. City of Washington, printed by Davis & Force, 1821."

PENETRABLE GLOOM OF THIS INTELLECTUAL DARKNESS, AND THE DEEP DEGRADATION OF THIS SERVITUDE, THE BRITISH NATION HAD PARTIALLY EMERGED." Yes! thus did he, without provocation, and in open violation of public and social decency, deliberately stigmatize the religion of Cœcilius Calvert, Charles Carroll, and O'Connel!

"How much," he proceeds, (page 6) "of these two qualities, (intelligence and spirit) the fountains of all amelioration in the condition of men, was stifled by these two principles of SUBSERVIENCY TO ECCLESIASTICAL USURPATION," &c. \*\* "this is not the occasion to inquire. Of their tendency to palsy the vigour, and enervate the faculties of man, all philosophical reasoning, and all actual experience, concur in testimony." "*They were the delusions of all Europe,* still the most enlightened and most improvable portion of the earth. \*\*\* THEIR SPIRITUAL FETTERS WERE FORGED BY SUBTLETY WORKING UPON SUPERSTITION." But here our man of books stumbled, in his headlong career, over the numberless achievements of Catholic intelligence, "bound and crippled," as he had described the human intellect, "by the double cords of ECCLESIASTICAL IMPOSTURE," &c.—and, by one desperate spring extricating himself from his embarrassment, he reached the old "*vantage ground.*"

"The CORRUPTIONS and USURPATIONS of the CHURCH, were the immediate objects of these reformers; but, at the foundation of all their exertions, there was a single plain and almost self-evident principle—that man has a right to the exercise of his own reason. It was *this principle* which the SOPHISTRY and RAPACITY of the CHURCH had OBSCURED and OBLITERATED; and which the intestine divisions of the same church itself first restored. The triumph of reason was the result of inquiry and discussion."

We are not writing a controversy for the information of our christian brethren who differ from us, and, therefore, shall not pause to detect the falsehoods, and refute the calumnies involved in this farrago of intolerant ignorance. The least instructed among you can do it for himself. You can decide whether he truly says, (page 8,) "at the glance of reason, the tiara would have fallen from the brow of priesthood, \*\* but for the sword" which protected it—"that sword which, like the flaming sword of the Cherubim, turned every way to debar access to the Tree of Life." You have some little knowledge of his "oppressors of the Church," and perhaps could prove that before he would have considered them "released from the manacles of eccle-

sistorical domination, the minds of men began to investigate the foundations of civil government." (Page 8.)

But, perhaps, you will consider this outrageous and unprovoked attack on your feelings, a mere electioneering trick of the aspiring Secretary, *inconsistent as it was with official decorum, in one entrusted with the regulation of our intercourse with the Catholic governments of Europe and America;* and in christian charity, you will, perhaps, excuse an anti-catholic cry, got up, for a single occasion, on this side of the water. We rest on broader ground. We pronounce it an ordinary effusion of a jaundiced heart; and, if you will accompany us in a brief review of his journal of his Silesian tour, twenty-eight years ago, you will, perhaps, accord with us—our limits will barely allow us to lay extracts of his work before you, with scarce a syllable of comment.

The third of his Silesian letters, contains this unmanly paragraph:—

"In Sprotau there is a convent of nuns, dedicated to St. Mary Magdalén, who, not being so liberal in their open intercourse with our sex as their great patroness, could not be visited by me."

We give this passage emphasized as we find it printed, lest the slanderous insinuation against the purity of these holy ladies, be imputed to the fraud of the transcribers. And yet further, we pledge ourselves, that were he to republish the paragraph, or that which follows, with a simple substitution of the names of the nuns of the visitation, at Georgetown, or the Sisters of Charity at Emmittsburg, the laws of his country would visit him with heavy penalties.

The nineteenth letter of the series, is polluted with a similar indecent libel. "There are" (in Schweidnitz) "four cloisters; but like most of the Silesian convents, they are almost entirely without monks or nuns; excepting one, of the order of St. Ursula, where seven and twenty poor sisters bewail their virginity; and of which my wife can give a better account than I; as the good nuns, according to the rules of their order, hold the male sex too much in abomination, to admit any of us, publicly, within their walls."

In the 13th letter, he pursues the same merry vein, concerning one of "the friends of God." "Her name was Hedwige, and she is known as a saint in the Roman Calendar. The Catholic Church at Berlin you know is dedicated to her. From the inscriptions on her pictures, of which there are two here in the Catholic Church at Lalmhaus, it would seem she was sainted for having repeatedly gone up the hill on foot to hear mass there."

In letter 30th he is more particular. "She was a daughter of

a Count of Baden, had been educated in a cloister, and prevailed upon her husband to squander almost all his revenues and a great part of his domains, in founding, endowing, and enriching religious houses. \* \* \* She and her husband both possessed some valuable qualities; but, the grounds upon which she was raised to the Senate of the Roman Catholic mythology, were her superstition, her excessive veneration for the monks, and above all, her liberality to the Church. Her son \* \* was so well educated in the same principles, and so faithfully practised them, as to have obtained the sirname of the *Pious!*"

And of similar import is the following passage in the 25th letter. "It" (the Cathedral at Breslau) contains reliques too—for what is a Roman Catholic Church without reliques? That of most note here is the staff of St. Elizabeth, with a silver spiral plate winding round it, upon which is engraved some account of her and her family. \* \* \* She was canonized in 1235, but whether, like St. Hedwige, for going on foot up an hill to hear mass, or for what other cause soever, does not appear."

The same letter proceeds—"a part of the head of St. John the Baptist (for they have not here as in other Churches the whole head) and his forefinger, are only shewn upon great festivals."

While on the subject of reliques, we may as well collect the testimony of our traveller, who blends with his details some hints upon faith and practice, new at least to us.

In letter 20th, he says, "in one corner of the Church" (of Wartha) "I saw an ugly picture of a face done upon silk, and a small silver point of a spear, each of them under a frame and a glass, with certificates that they had been *touched* by certain holy reliques at Rome and Ancona, such as the real face of Christ, and the spear which pierced his side. It should seem that, according to the Romish system, these real reliques have a certain magnetic virtue, and that any thing touched by them becomes as efficacious as themselves. While I was looking at the unseemly mask, a woman, after kneeling for some time before the great altar, came and devoutly kissed the glass that covered the face, and then tripped away as lightly as if she was sure all her sins were forgiven."

In letter 23d we have the following:—"In the year 1218, a peasant by the name of Jann, being stone blind, happened to pass before a hollow lime tree, and was instantly restored to sight by the irradiation proceeding from it; which upon inspection he found issued from a small image of the holy virgin in the hollow of the tree. Of this fact there can be no doubt; for

it is represented in a picture which hangs directly over the spot where the lime tree stood. A Chapel was soon after built, &c. the miraculous image is still kept in a glass frame. \* \* \* Many a hundred thousand of *poor blind people* have, in the course of six centuries repaired to it for *health*; but, of its efficacy to heal *their diseases* there is no testimony here. They have probably all returned *at least as blind as they came*. \* \* \* \* I was attended by one of the clerical persons who officiated at the Church, but he was so ashamed of his relics, that I perceived it gave him pain when I read the inscriptions around them, purporting what they are."

We will now pass to the author's specimens of Catholic traditions. In letter 30th he says:—"Aricislaus" (the Polish Duke by whom, according to Mr. Adams, was founded the Bishopric of Breslau) "was born blind, but at the feast given to celebrate the happy event of his birth, he opened his eyes. This was an evident presage of his conversion to Christianity. The motive which finally produced this regeneration was equally forcible. He had kept seven mistresses, and yet could get no children. The Holy Catholic faith was recommended to him as a recipe to cure barrenness; accordingly he was baptised, married a Bohemian princess, and begat sons and daughters."

We repeat that with the private opinions of Mr. Adams we have nothing to do. Let him think of Catholics and their religion as he pleases—but, when he comes forward as an author to retail, under the sanction of his name, every absurdity or profanity he has gathered from our adversaries, in a country, of which himself has said, (letter 3d) "there is, perhaps, no part of Europe where the root of bitterness between the two parties is yet so deep, and cleaves with such stubbornness to the ground"—when he strains his turgid pen to point the calumny or the sneer—when he strives to add the weight of his own superficial observation to the scale already surcharged with prejudice against us, and supplies the deficiencies in his own opportunities by the foulest inuendo,—let the zest of his ribaldry be its reward—but let him not expect the votes of those he has vilified and slandered, through their favour, to an individual, however estimable.

But it is for his graver charges against us that he is chiefly responsible—these are the darts he has barbed most carefully, and which rankle deepest. In his 41st letter he has recorded this atrocious accusation. "From the period of the foundation" (of the Silesian bishopric, A. D. 966) "for more than four centuries, the opinion was almost universally prevalent here, as in the rest of Europe, that the COMPENDIUM OF ALL HUMAN VIRTUE, and

THE ATONEMENT OF ALL HUMAN VICE, consisted in founding, building, and endowing, Churches, Cloisters, and other religious institutions."

But the notions inculcated in the following extracts are yet more injurious. In letter 35th, he says:—"The house of Austria \*\* continued zealously Catholic; and, by uniting the principles of intolerance with the practice of oppression, compelled the Protestants, not only of its own dominions, but almost throughout Europe, to combine in leagues for the mutual support of each other." Again, in the 41st letter, "The event of this" (the thirty years war) "was to leave the Silesian Protestants almost at the mercy of their temporal sovereign, who adhered to the Catholic cause, and was guided by the Catholic doctrine of bringing back all stragglers from the Church by compulsion." In letter 3d, we have this—"The Catholics hate the Protestants the more for their having, now, the secure and unlimited liberty in their worship!" In letter 24 he says—"Breslau contains upwards of sixty thousand inhabitants, of whom about one third are Catholics; \* \* \* Nine of these Churches suffice for the Protestant inhabitants; the Catholics, of course, have twenty-six; many of which are, however, cloisters; and the streets are full of friars of all colours, black, white, and grey, with all their trumpery." Subsequently, in letter 41st, he has decked out a terrible bug-bear, by way of impressing the lesson he insidiously teaches, and which, you shall soon find, has not been thrown away. "The DOMINION which the Roman Catholic clergy had obtained OVER THE SOULS, BODIES, AND ESTATES OF MEN. \* \* \* Their power was built upon a foundation too solid to be overturned by an arm of flesh." Now for the lesson. His 41st letter, which, but that its author was known as the American minister at Berlin, might, from its internal marks, have been ascribed, with plausibility, to some hired agent of the British Government, presents in connexion with a very incorrect outline of the ecclesiastical history of Silesia, the following assertions: That the King of Prussia is the actual head of the Catholic Church in his dominions, and that the confirmation of the Bishops by the Pope is admitted "only as a bare formality," his spiritual jurisdiction terminating in that act. In other words, that the Catholic Church in Prussia is modelled as regards ecclesiastical polity, on the same principles with the Protestant Episcopal Church of England; which arrangement, though frequently tendered them by the British Government, the Catholics have as uniformly rejected, as being incompatible with the integrity of their religion, which indeed is self evident to any

one the least acquainted with their doctrines. Mr. Adams, however, significantly adds, the King of Prussia “met with some opposition to the exercise of this power from the Chapter, *but they soon found resistance useless, and submitted.*” The British ministers understood him, as appears from the annexed quotation from the “Truth Teller,” of June 23d, 1828.

In the debate in the House of Commons upon Sir Francis Burdet’s motion in favour of the Catholics, the Solicitor General said—“In Prussia, where the Protestants formed the greater part of the population, and the Catholics the smaller, a system was maintained which was directly at variance with the principle insisted upon by the Hon. Baronet. He found it stated, in a printed report, by Mr. Adams, a gentleman of acuteness and intelligence, who was now at the head of the American government, and who, at the period in question, was Minister at Berlin, that in Silesia, which was a Catholic country, the Pope confirmed the Bishops only in form, the King of Prussia being declared the head of all the churches in his dominions. There was an appeal to the Sovereign, to the Synod, but none to the Pope, and confirmation by the Bishops of Rome was only a mere formality. This was the statement of Mr. Adams—a statement which stood upon record in that House. Now he (the Solicitor General) maintained that if, in this country they only insisted with decent firmness on the same system, they would soon find the Catholics submitting to it. (Loud cheers from the opposition benches.) This was the decided impression on his mind.”

We will not pause to moot the curious question, how a printed report, from the American Minister at Berlin, came to be “on record” in the British House of Commons, but will barely surmise, that the supporters of this “Mr. Adams,” whose ignorance or malevolence has co-operated to rivet the chain upon bleeding Ireland, must credit us for far more christian charity than himself would allow, when they demand of us a return of benefits in the direct proportion of the evil he has inflicted.

In letter third, speaking of the church at Sprottau, he says—“The most remarkable thing I met in the church was a paper posted up on the inner side of a confessional, written in latin, and containing a list of the sins to which the ordinary priest was forbidden to grant absolution, as being expressly reserved for the consideration of the holy father himself. I expected to have found, at least, some heinous crimes upon the list, but unless the murder of a priest may be considered as of that denomination, there was not one.”

One word more, from the 42d letter, in reference to the tendency (according to Mr. Adams) of the Catholic Religion, to obstruct the progress of intellectual improvement. "In Silesia they had at first many old prejudices to contend with. The indolence of the Catholic Clergy was averse to the new troublesome duty imposed on them. Their zeal was alarmed at the danger arising from this dispersion of light to the stability of their church. They considered alike the spirit of innovation and the spirit of inquiry as their natural enemies."

But these were the sentiments of a young man—let us observe whether, as a teacher of youth at Cambridge, he swerved from the line of anti-Catholic detraction, in which his literary career began—we quote from the Cambridge (we believe they were not found worthy of a second) edition of his "lectures on rhetoric."—His inaugural address, delivered June 12th, 1806, affords the following specimen of his candour and research—"Then succeeded the midnight of the monkish ages, when, with the other liberal arts, eloquence slumbered in the profound darkness of the cloister." (Vol. I. p. 20.)

But the poppies still shed their narcotick dews over the fairest regions of the earth, witness Mr. Adams—(Vol. I pages 323, 333-4-5-6-7-8.) after premising that "the pulpit has been the instrument of the worst abuses of the Romish church"—"that Athanasius and Peter the Hermit, successively, and successfully employed this mighty engine for the propagation of error," he goes on to say, "There is a striking difference between the eloquence of the pulpit, as it has appeared in the compositions of the French, and of the English divines. A French sermon is a popular discourse addressed almost exclusively to the feelings of the auditory. \*\* An English sermon is, or rather was until of late years, a cold, unimpassioned application to the understanding. \*\*\* The principle cause of the difference \*\*\* is no other than the Protestant reformation. In France, and in other Roman Catholic countries, \*\* the exclusion of reasoning from the desk is just and consistent: the christian is not allowed to be a reasoner. \*\*\* The sacred scriptures themselves are held to be mysteries above his understanding. \*\*\* Under such a church there can be no occasion for argumentative sermons, and reasoning is very naturally expelled from their pulpits. \*\*\* A Roman Catholic believes in the existence of a God, in the immortality of his own soul, and in a future state of retribution, because the holy church has told him they are articles of faith. But, he is not allowed to ask the reason why. A Protestant is told to believe these fundamental points of religion, because upon examination

he will find them satisfactorily proven to his reason. \* \* \* \* The volume of sacred inspiration is opened before the preacher, and it is his duty to make it profitable to his hearers, for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. The field here opened to the Protestant divine is inexhaustible. To the Roman Catholic preacher it is never opened at all. For with what propriety could he reason to his audience from a book which they are not permitted to read? \* \* \* The societies of christians, who place themselves under the ministration of a spiritual monitor, have a right to expect that he should consider, and treat them as rational, no less than sensitive beings"—But it was not sufficient to stigmatise all **ROMAN CATHOLICS AS FOOLS**—A VENERABLE PORTION OF THEM, who have dispensed light and happiness throughout every region of the earth, which has been pressed by the foot of the missionary, in the catalogue of whose *sacred band* is eurolled the name of **JOHN CARROLL**, must be branded KNAVES—see vol. II. page 178. "This (equivocation) "is one of the *vilest modifications of falsehood; BUT IT WAS TAUGHT AMONG THE DOCTRINES OF THE JESUITS.*"

What wonder after this, that we are classed among heathens and idolaters! Hear Mr. Adams, (vol. I. page 241.) "Among the ancient heathens, the mythological doctrine and history supplied a copious fund, for encomiastick eloquence, in their numberless divinities, demi-gods and heroes. The Roman Catholics," (mark the antithesis!) "by an easy substitution, have reserved to themselves the same themes in their hierarchy of saints, angels, and archangels,

"Thrones dominations, princedoms, virtues, powers;"

But the Protestant communities know too little of those 'orders bright,' those supernatural intelligences, to honour them with that panegyric to which, by their rank and dignity in the scale of being they may, perhaps, be entitled; but which, in our ignorance, has an unfortunate tendency to lead us from veneration to worship, from the adoration of the True God to *the idolatry of his creatures.*"

Thus, friends, did this intolerant scribbler, whom you are modestly requested to support for the sake of a worthy Catholic gentleman, labour to poison the wells of knowledge, for the pure lip of the American youth, who, by their accidental advantages in the world, were to exert an important influence upon your destinies! As legislators to regulate the terms upon which many of you, *foreigners*, were to be admitted to our political fraternity—as lawyers and judges to control or excite the prejudices of your fellow citizens against you, in the Courts of justice—as authors to

enlighten or cloud the public mind; and, generally, as members of the same community, to impart to, or withhold from you the endearing charities of life. Is it surprising that his own official practice should have conformed to his own principles and feelings? That he could not even conduct a diplomatic correspondence, in reference to a most desirable object, (the guaranty to our Protestant fellow citizens, resident or trading in the exclusively Catholic States of South America, of the free exercise of their religion,) without indulging a most offensive intemperance of expression, calculated to defeat the very measure in view? (See his letter to Mr. Anderson, dated May 27th, 1823, and his message of March 15th, 1826.) No! but it is surprising, that men of common prudence and common decency should dare insult the Catholics of Baltimore, by supposing their votes transferable at the bidding of one man.

We reiterate our solemn reprobation of this blending of religion with our political discussions. We claim an exemption from such unhallowed appeals, as a fair corollary from our constitutional liberty of conscience, to men of every persuasion. We venerate religion too highly to prostitute her to party purposes. Had the friends of Mr. Adams permitted the Catholics to form their opinions upon the great political question which divides us, upon legitimate grounds, the political abilities and principles of the respective candidates, we should never have come forward with this address. Not that these things were unknown to us, but because we deprecate the excitement of religious prejudices, as being equally offensive to God and to man; as tending to counteract the beneficent dispensations of our Creator, and to subvert the true foundations of popular government. But appeals have repeatedly been made to the feelings of Catholics, as such, by an administration paper in this very town. An administration address, composed by a distinguished Catholic of North Carolina, (Mr. Wm. Gaston) was republished in this state, with a preface *expatiating on his devotion to the tenets and practices of our church*, and circulated in those counties where Catholics are most numerous. And but now, an aged Catholic gentleman is, for the first time in his life, presented for the suffrages of the people of Baltimore, as an administration candidate, with the same undeniable object of influencing his friends of the same communion—Nay! the partizans of the administration already triumphantly proclaim, that the Catholics, and especially the Irish, will follow in the train of their fellow christian and countryman, and appeals have been made to more than one, whose names, if demanded, shall be

forthcoming, on this very ground. Are we guilty of these things? Because we disclaim attack, are we precluded from defence? Because we have not spoken till compelled, are our lips to be sealed for ever? We make no secret of our political preferences, though we have sought to infuse them into others only by constitutional means; and we rejoice that in the present emergency, which was not of our seeking, we are covered by the example of the pious and amiable among other denominations. An attempt was recently made to bias the pending election by a statement of the sentiments of the venerable ministry of the Methodist church. Numbers of those devoted men are daily coming forward with disavowals of the preference imputed to them, though censuring, like us, the course to which they have been impelled. We trust that, in meeting a similar artifice in a similar way, we shall experience an equal measure of liberality.

In the execution of our task, we have laboured to spare the feelings of every christian, however he may differ from us. No one can justly take offence, if we represent ourselves as injured by charges which we solemnly deny. Nor, circumstanced as we are, should any one rebuke us for resisting an insidious appeal to our favour by shewing that no ground of favour exists.

The friends of the administration say, "Catholics! support our ticket because our candidate is a Catholic." We reply, "Catholics! vote your conscientious sentiments upon the great question in issue, without respect to the intermediate agents." The rejoinder comes, "but an influential Catholic is the friend of Mr. Adams, and *that* should recommend *him* to the favour of Catholics." We answer, "let Mr. Adams speak to us, as Catholics, *for himself*."

We profess to guard our Church against the intrusions of civil discord, as anxiously as any. We feel as deep an interest in the preservation of our constitutional securities, than which none is more precious than the broad line traced by the wisdom of our fathers, between polities and religion; and we yield to none in fidelity to those institutions which protect it. We invoke with honest pride, the testimony, in our favour, of the Father of his Country: "I presume your fellow citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution, and the establishment of their government—or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed."<sup>\*</sup> And we appeal with equal confidence, to the voice of impartial history.

\*Gen. Washington's reply to an address presented him in 1799, by John Carroll, since Archbishop of Baltimore, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Dominic Lynch and Thomas Fitzsimmons, on behalf of the Catholic Clergy and

"The Legislature of the Catholic province of Maryland, with a magnanimity unusual in such circumstances, extended to all sects, that associated with them, the entire enjoyment of religious freedom. And so far had they been taught, by their own sufferings, to appreciate and revere this sacred privilege, that even a contumelious expression against other denominations was expressly forbidden by their laws."\*

In conclusion, we renew the expression of our regret that allusions to an individual we esteem, should have been forced into such a discussion. We have conducted it, however, with the utmost regard to his private delicacy. For what, though painful to us, was unavoidable, the blame must rest on those who began the contest.

WILLIAM JENKINS,  
EDWARD I. WILLSON,  
MATTHEW BENNETT,  
WILLIAM GEORGE READ,

PHILIP LAURENSEN,  
T. PARKIN SCOTT,  
JOHN CREAGH.

\* Sanderson's Biography of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence. Introduction page 50.

W 4 3







